

REMARKS

The Examiner allowed claims 40-46.

The Examiner objected to claims 25 and 35 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 20-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Takemura (US 5,587,326).

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 23, 33, 34, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Niitsu (US 5,137,839).

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niitsu in view of Candelaria (US 5,360,986) and Grider et al. (US 6,030,874)..

The Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niitsu in view of Morishita (US 5,708,281).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 USC § 102

As to claim 25, the Examiner indicated under the Allowable Subject Matter of the September 14, 2005 Office Action that “the prior art does not teach or suggest, in combination with other claimed limitations, a bipolar transistor with a polysilicon emitter containing both arsenic and antimony.”

In response, Applicants have amended claim 25 to include all the limitations of intervening claim 20 and have retained the limitation “wherein said dopant species is arsenic and wherein said polysilicon grain size modulating species is antimony.”

In light of Applicants amendment of claim 25, Applicants believe that claim 25 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 23, 24, 47 and 48 depend from claim 25, Applicants believe that claims 23, 24, 47 and 48 are likewise in condition for allowance.

As to claim 35, the Examiner indicated under the Allowable Subject Matter of the September 14, 2005 Office Action that the “prior art does not teach or suggest, in combination with other claimed limitations, a bipolar transistor with a polysilicon emitter containing carbon that has a base current lower than the base current of an identical bipolar transistor with a polysilicon emitter not containing carbon. Niitsu teaches that the base current of a bipolar transistor varies with the grain diameter of the polysilicon emitter, but does not specify that the base current of the bipolar transistor having a polysilicon emitter containing carbon is *lower* than the base current of an identical bipolar transistor with a polysilicon emitter not containing carbon.”

In response, Applicants have amended claim 35 to include all the limitations of intervening claim 33 and have retained the limitation “wherein the base current of said bipolar

transistor is lower than the base current of an identical bipolar transistor fabricated without said carbon species."

In light of Applicants amendment of claim 35, Applicants believe that claim 35 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 36-38 depend from claim 35, Applicants believe that claims 36-38 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

With respect to claims 26, Applicants believe the Examiner rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC 103 is moot in light of Applicants cancellation of claim 26.

With respect to claims 38 and 39, since Applicants have argued *supra* that amended claim 35 is in condition for allowance and since claims 38 and 39 have been amended to depend from claim 35, Applicants believe claims 38 and 39 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: Geiss et al.

Dated: 01/31/2006

BY: Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Reg. No. 44,688
FOR:
Anthony M. Palagonia
Registration No.: 41,237

3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850
Agent Direct Dial Number: (802)-899-5460